

## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the subject application as amended. In response to the Office Action mailed 08/21/08, Applicant is filing this amendment. Claims 1-7, 9-15, 17, 19 and 20 are pending.

In the Office Action mailed 08/21/08, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-6, 9-15, 17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Cremin et al. (U.S. Patent Application Pub. 2002/0018444; “Cremin”). Furthermore, the Examiner has rejected claims 7 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cremin in view of Richter (U.S. Patent Application Pub. 2003/0099254).

Applicant has noted the Examiner’s reasons for the rejections and respectfully disagrees with the rejections and the Examiner’s reasoning thereof in light of the amendment to independent claims 1, 9 and 17. Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9 and 17 to clearly recite that the first data format is based on a SPI protocol that has a byte-length granularity of two bytes and the second data format is based on other than the SPI protocol. Claims 1 and 9 recite that the data aligner is to multiplex each two-byte segment of the data in the first data format to remove interleaved command segments from the received data, prepend a fragment remaining from earlier received data when the fragment is present, and contiguously align remaining data segments to the fixed byte length boundary. Claim 17 recites that the aligning multiplexes each two-byte segment of the data in the first data format to remove interleaved command segments from the received data, prepends a fragment remaining from earlier received data when the fragment is present, and contiguously aligns remaining data segments to the fixed byte length boundary.

Applicant submits that Cremin, as well as Richter, fail to disclose this aspect of the claimed embodiments of the invention. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the amended claims overcome the Examiner’s rejections based on Cremin alone, or in combination with Richter, and Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and requests the Examiner to allow pending claims 1-7, 9-15, 17, 19 and 20, as amended.

If there are any fee shortages related to this response, please charge such fee shortages to Deposit Account No. 50-2126.

Respectfully submitted,

GARLICK, HARRISON & MARKISON  
(Customer No. 51472)

Date: 11/21/2008

By: /William W. Kidd; Reg. No. 31,772/  
William W. Kidd  
Reg. No. 31,772  
Phone: (512) 263-1842  
Fax No: (512) 263-1469  
Email: wkidd@texaspatents.com